



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Architectural & Historic Board of Review

John Caputo, Chair
Allyn Marzulla, Vice Chair
John Workley, Secretary
Amy Manko
Françoise Massardier-Kenney
William Ray
Jamie Sredinski

Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
Amanda Krickovich, Associate Planner

Wednesday, May 14, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call To Order

Acting Chair Marzulla called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Architectural & Historic Board of Review of the City of Hudson at 7:30 p.m., in accordance with the Sunshine Laws of the State of Ohio, O.R.C. Section 121.22.

II. Roll Call

Present: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Mr. Ray

III. Public Comment

Chair Marzulla opened the meeting to public comments for anyone wanting to address the Board. There were no comments.

IV. Consent Applications

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

A. [AHBR 25-416](#) 146 Hudson Street (Historic District)

Alteration (Roof Replacement)

This AHBR item was approved on the Consent Agenda.

V. Old Business

[AHBR 25-368](#) 55 N Oviatt (Historic District)

Addition (Enclosure of Existing Porch)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting a site visit was conducted on April 29, 2025,

and reviewed the staff comment and recommendation.

Mr. Chris Lachman, CSL Consulting, and Mr. Rick Brown, LD Architects, noted the vertical siding above the window has been changed to 6-inch lap siding.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: Their inability to do a close up inspection of the house, that part of the character of the house, as it exists, is lost with enclosing the porch, that the porch is on the non-historical portion of the house, that the changes to the front of the house are not compatible with page 14 of the preservation brief, that past AHBR approved renovations have changed portions of a project in unacceptable ways, that the preservation brief does not apply since the porch is not historical, that the historical character of the house was changed when the porch addition was built, that the columns and fret work will not be affected, that the windows do not match the existing windows, that the porch is constructed of sliders, that the type standards are within the LDC Standards, but the Secretary of the Interior's Standards might should be applied instead of the LDC Standards, appreciation for the area above the doors being changed from vertical to horizontal, and the proposed change is on a non historic portion of a historic house in the Historic District.

Discussion also took place regarding where and how the new structure attaches to the column, the precedent setting issue of approving this application when other applicants desire to change the front of a historic house, and the Board viewed another enclosed front porch on a prominent street with no details on the porch addition.

Ms. Kenney made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, to approve the application with the understanding that it will be behind the column and will not alter the existing dimensions of the columns. The Board also recognizes this is a non historic addition on a historic house in the Historic District.

Aye: 4 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

Nay: 1 - Mr. Workley

VI. New Business

A. [AHBR 25-417](#) 7 College Street (Historic District)

Fence (6 foot privacy)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site and noting that the applicant was suppose to bring the elevations and drawing of the fence section.

Mr. Bruce Pepper, Northeast Ohio Fence, was present and stated he thought the photos were sent with the original application.

The Board determined the application could not be considered without the missing information.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be continued. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

B. [AHBR 25-361](#) 33 E. Streetsboro (Historic District)

Accessory Structure (Accessory Dwelling Unit)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying and describing the project, the site plan, and reviewing the staff comments and materials.

Mr. Bob Mastriana, architect, and Mr. Alan Sveda, noted the house is not visible from the road, the distance of the building from the property lines, that aside from the building area the site will remain as is, the types of materials, and windows to be used.

The Board, applicant, and staff noted: The shape of the roof, elements similar to the main body and that the details and shutters need to be applied to all four sides. Also discussed were: The type of Pella windows, that the front door needs to be wood, the parged block foundation material, and that the specification sheets were submitted.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with a wood door as approved by staff, and the revised items which were detailed in the drawings.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

C. [AHBR 25-429](#) 304 Bicknell Drive

Accessory Structure (Detached Garage - Attached Garage Renovation)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying and describing the elevations.

Mr. Matthew Powers, Powers Construction, noted: The location on the house where the previous garage doors existed, that the siding will be blended as much as possible, that there will be no vertical joints, that the vertical siding on the front and rear will match, and the height of the addition is permitted by the LDC.

The Board, applicant, and staff, noted the drawing have an error showing existing shutters on the back, in fact there are no shutters on the back.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with the garage having a consistent gable as approved by staff, and that there be no shutters on the rear of the house. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

D. [AHBR 25-11](#) 44 Owen Brown (Historic District)

Accessory Structure (Detached Garage)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Trevor Stewart, homeowner, noted the building has been moved back five-feet, windows and doors have been added, the height was changed, the siding will match the existing, shutters will not be applied since there are no existing shutters, the fenestration issues have been addressed by moving the windows and doors within 12-feet of each other, and that the fence screens most of the building.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed if revised drawings will be needed, the height of the garage as seen from the road, how the building will be used, that the height of the building has been reduced by 18-inches, the need for fenestration above the centered doors, the possibility of a site line study from Owen Brown Street, the window grid to use, why the building has the look of a two story building, and the need for windows on the upper portion of the side elevations,

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Workley, that this AHBR Application be continued and the applicant submit revised drawings. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

E. [AHBR 25-448](#) 5986 Stow Road

Accessory Structure (Detached Garage)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site plans, elevations, and staff comments.

Mr. Matthew Hansen, applicant, noted no new concrete driveway or pad will be poured, and shutters that match the house shutters will be used.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed, that the back of the garage abuts the Summit County Metro Parks, and that the fenestration meets the Design Standards.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR application be approved as amended with shutters to match the house and a window on the left side. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

F. [AHBR 25-471](#) 102 Ravenna Street

Accessory Structure (Pavilion)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site plan and recommending approval as submitted.

Mr. Stephen Noffsinger, applicant, noted the open structure, and the type of materials.

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Workley, that this AHBR Application be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

G. [AHBR 25-258](#) 6661 Meadow Farm Drive

Alterations (Windows Replacement)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the house, describing the project and window grid types, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Sage Majeskie, contractor, stated the plan is to make the windows in the front 9 over 6.

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that this AHBR Application be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

H. [AHBR 25-394](#) 5387 Wilshire Park Drive

Addition (Rear Porch)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the elevations, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Shawn Hook, Hook Home Maintenance, noted the column structure will be the traditional look of option two, and the roof will be shingled to match the house.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with the singles matching the house and option two be used for the columns. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

I. [AHBR 25-376](#) 36 Pinewood Lane

Addition (Covered Patio)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site plan and elevations, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Adam Timan, applicant, described where the roof will meet the existing house, and that the windows structure will be changed to bypass windows - that open in the center,

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed, the privacy wall, the slider windows function, and the need for specification sheets for the materials.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with four panel glass at the wall line of the existing house, the formation of the proposed canopy, the submission to staff of the materials sheets, and the details of the privacy wall. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

J. [AHBR 25-349](#) 2875 Pioneer Trail

Addition (Kitchen & Dining Room)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Eric Kuczek, Sojourn Architects, stated the foundation will match the existing block foundation, that the window grids will be six-over-six, and that the back of the house plans do not include shutters because of the large number of windows causing the elevation to be too crowded. Mr. Kuczek also stated the aluminum in the gable is to highlight that area, and that the hip and flat roofs were for both functional and esthetic purposes.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed the materials needing to terminate on an inside corner, that a revision has been submitted that removes the transom windows in the rear, that the panel size and layout below the windows needs to be more cohesive with the window, that the grid patterns of the windows need to be consistent, that one side of the house has mixed siding styles, and the possibility of extending the gable which will allow siding termination at an inside corner

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with the transom windows removed, the window grids being six-by-six, no shutters on the back side, the foundation to match the existing, and the exterior cladding be modified to match the existing or terminate at inside corners. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

K. [AHBR 25-474](#) 78 Aurora Street (Historic District)

[Addition (Kitchen, Laundry Room, Elevator)]

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site plan, noting the project has received a variance from BZBA, and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Ms. Rebecca Pantuso, Pantuso Architecture, noted the project will add an elevator and addition in order for the residents to age in place. Ms. Pantuso then: Displayed photos of a 1950's addition and described the proposed changes to this addition, agreed to change the stepping up three windows, and noted that there are a variety of existing foundation materials.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: The need for a site visit, the alignment of the windows, the shed roof next to the cupola, if the double windows on the second floor can be moved toward the center of the wall for better elevation symmetry, if the window on the right side of the elevation can be centered on wall, the comparison of the columns around the house, the seven-foot blank wall and lack of fenestration, the possibility of matching the two panels below the screened porch on the seven-foot blank wall, and the shape of the roof on the tower which matches the pitch of the existing roof and possible alternatives.

The Board discussed conducting a site visit with the historic consultant to request an opinion regarding the massing and general character of the project.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be continued and that the historical consultant conduct a site visit with the Board to review the massing and general character of the project. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

L. [AHBR 2025-13549](#) West Streetsboro Street

New Construction (Single-family dwelling)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site plan and introducing the applicants.

Mr. John Russell, Prestige Builder Group, described: The revised plans, elements of the house, and a willingness to, but preference not to, bring the front door forward.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: Appreciation for the garage being relocated, the front projection being five-feet forward of the allowable distance, that the trees in the front yard will remain, that the house is 250-feet back on the lot, the exceptional design, and the trees and distance from the street give reason for an exception to the front projection requirement.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Strdinski, that since the structure is set back 250-feet from the road, and that the trees provide screening, to approve the application. The motion was approved by the following vote.

VII. Other Business

A. [AHBR 4.23.2024](#) Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting: April 23, 2023.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that the April 23, 2025 Minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

VIII. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar stated the subcommittee update work will continue.

IX. Adjournment

Chair Marzulla adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Allyn Marzulla, Acting Chair

John Workley, Secretary

Joe Campbell, Executive Assistant

Upon approval by the Architectural & Historic Board of Review, this official written summary of the meeting minutes shall become a permanent record, and the official minutes shall also consist of a permanent audio and video recording, excluding executive sessions, in accordance with Codified Ordinances, Section 252.04, Minutes of Architectural and Historic Board of Review, Board of Zoning and Building Appeals, and Planning Commission.

* * *